



TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

Founded 1876
Incorporated 1899

Minutes General Plan Steering Committee Wednesday, January 20, 2016 6:00 p.m. Jerome Town Hall, 600 Clark Street

ITEM 1: Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Doug Freund called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

Roll call was taken by Albert Sengstock, Zoning Administrator. Members present were Chair Doug Freund, Jane Moore, Margie Hardie, Natalie Barlow, Suzy Mound, and Denise Guth. Mimi Currier had an excused absence. Staff present were Al Sengstock, Zoning Administrator and Jennifer Julian, Minute Taker.

Members of the public present were Doree Christensen, resident and Randy Garrison, Cottonwood City Council member.

ITEM 2: Approve meeting minutes of October 28, 2015

The meeting minutes of October 28, 2015 were approved at the previous meeting. The minutes of January 13, 2016 and January 20, 2016 will be approved at the next scheduled meeting.

ITEM 3: Public Comment

There was no public comment.

ITEM 4: Review and approve changes from last session

Ms. Hardie objected to having two meetings on one agenda. The agenda for tonight's meeting is incorrect. She would prefer separate agendas for each meeting so that each one is accurate and so that it will be clear in the future.

Mr. Sengstock said that the combined agenda was a one-time occurrence due to time and staff constraints. From February, each meeting will have a separate agenda posted.

ITEM 5: Continue discussions regarding the Economic Development Element

Mr. Sengstock read the new Economic Development Element introduction as written by Mr. Freund.

Ms. Moore questioned if the Town would "always be open to specific proposals" (fourth paragraph). Mr. Sengstock suggested eliminating "always." The group seemed to agree.

Ms. Hardie asked about the third paragraph: "enterprises which support Jerome's mission." Do we have a mission written down? What is it and where is it? Mr. Freund believes the mission statement may be in the document that conferred Landmark Status.

Ms. Hardie pointed out in the second paragraph that "with success come new challenges" should be with success comes new challenges.

Ms. Hardie also asked about a phrase in the fourth paragraph. What is a proposal that would not “forfeit the Town’s charms?” Is this about the types of retail businesses in the Town, which we can’t really control, as we discussed previously? Mr. Sengstock gave the example of new buildings on infill lots or a renovation of a commercial use following DRB guidelines. The town cannot control what a retail shop sells but it can ensure that construction meets the Town’s guidelines.

Ms. Guth said that the comprehensive plan is a guideline and an encouragement, not a zoning document. However, in the 1981 plan there is something that discusses the uniqueness of items sold in Jerome unlike other communities. There is an unwritten agreement among business owners not to duplicate types of shops or products. She would like to see that encouragement continued.

Ms. Barlow asked about a line in the third paragraph. “It is acknowledged that the Town has relatively little control over the exact nature of the businesses which chose to establish themselves in Jerome.” She wondered if this line is necessary.

Mr. Sengstock said that free enterprise in the zoning code has little control over specific uses. But he has included the following line: “However, the Town can offer encouragement to enterprises which support Jerome’s mission as a National Historic Landmark and as a residential community.” Ms. Barlow would prefer to keep the sentence about the encouragement but omit the other. Several committee members agreed.

After discussion, the paragraph now reads: The present version of this Economic Development Element is intended to describe long-range economic principles. It also offers cautions which are intended to keep Jerome economically vital, while not undermining those basic small-town attributes which define the unique community of Jerome. However, the Town offers encouragement to enterprises which support Jerome’s mission as a National Historic Landmark and as a residential community.

Ms. Hardie felt the phrase “the present version of this Economic Development Element” in the third paragraph is confusing. Is this the 2016 version, or the 2035? Mr. Freund suggested that the sentence start This Economic Development Element... The committee agreed.

Ms. Christensen read the last sentence of second paragraph. Rather than “...strike a balance between the commercial and the residential” she suggested “...strike a balance between commercial and residential values and needs while protecting the National Historic Landmark status.”

Mr. Sengstock suggested instead “...while being sensitive to our historic status.”

Ms. Guth felt that the phrase “sensitive to historic status” could be interpreted in different ways that wouldn’t necessarily ensure protection. She suggested “maintaining our historic status.” The sentence now reads: In addition to these constraints are fundamental questions of how to strike a balance between commercial and residential values and needs while maintaining our historic status.

Ms. Hardie asked about annexation in the fourth paragraph. She doesn’t know why it is included. Mr. Sengstock said that annexation is not a possibility now, but later it might be considered.

Ms. Hardie objected to including the Town Council in the sentence regarding annexation, because the group cannot speak for them.

Ms. Moore agreed. She and Ms. Guth then explained the history of a previous annexation effort.

Mr. Sengstock proposed a reworked sentence: "The participants in drafting this General Plan do not support the expansion of commercial or industrial zoning districts for the express objective of bringing large scale commercial or industrial activity to the Town." This statement says the Town is going to use infill or develop existing zoned properties, rather than carve off a large chunk of land for development.

Mr. Garrison suggested: "The participants in drafting this General Plan, and the Town Council in ratifying this plan, express no intent of expanding the economic potential of the Town." The committee could or could not add the expectation of annexation.

Ms. Hardie preferred to omit "the participants" and refer more generally to "this plan."

Mr. Freund said annexation could be addressed historically.

Ms. Guth wondered if a housing development would be an industrial or commercial expansion. Mr. Sengstock said that would be an annexation. He gave an example of a specific property.

Mr. Garrison observed that residential expansion is a byproduct of commercial expansion.

There was a discussion about maintaining historic status.

Ms. Barlow referred to "recommendations and objectives which will guide Jerome's economy into the future" (location unclear). She wants the committee to make recommendations, not just strike everything out. Ms. Hardie said the committee should make suggestions, not pronouncements. Ms. Barlow agreed.

Ms. Moore said that she had no problem with the paragraph as rewritten by Mr. Sengstock to remove the Town Council and annexation. She felt that the intent and suggestions of the participants now will be helpful in the future.

Mr. Sengstock read the paragraph as revised: *In drafting this General Plan, there is no specific intention of expanding commercial or industrial zoning districts for the expressed objective of bringing large-scale commercial or industrial activity to the Town. However, the Town will be open to specific proposals which benefit the citizens of Jerome while not forfeiting the charms of Jerome's small-town, historic community. Such proposals will be considered individually via established process and public hearings.*

Ms. Moore said that SHPO did make a comment that annexation outside the historic district could distract from our historic status. She wondered if something should be included about what being a National Historic Landmark involves. Ms. Mound agreed. Mr. Freund also agreed, but said it has not been decided how much to address in the historic preservation element.

There was general discussion about the level of support in the Town for the Historic Landmark Status.

The committee turned to a discussion of Page 54, Goals and Objectives. Mr. Sengstock read the four goals from the 1981 plan.

Ms. Hardie liked the first and third original goals.

Ms. Moore liked the original goal one better than the new one, and proposed combining it with the new goal three: "Provide stable year-round employment for the residents of Jerome while assuring that preservation of Jerome's historic character is always a key component to any new business development effort."

Ms. Christensen asked if "key component" should rather be a "key consideration." "Component" implies that the business must be historical. Ms. Guth disagreed. She reads the sentence that the preservation of the historic character is the key component not the new business.

Ms. Moore gave the example of a 7-11 wanting to come to town. It would provide a service to the residents but how would it affect the Town's historic character? Mr. Sengstock said in that case, whatever is built would need to go through the Design Review Board to ensure that it is compatible with the Town.

Ms. Moore wondered if the preservation of the historical character needed to be included at this point in the document. Mr. Sengstock said maybe not, as it is something that is already done. He also pointed out that the new goals were already considered by the committee and accepted.

Ms. Moore said that the committee is now trying to condense the section as they agreed to do in the last meeting.

There was general discussion of specific properties and limitations to development.

Mr. Freund said perhaps something about parking should be included in the Economic Development Section.

Mr. Sengstock suggested as a goal: "To provide stable employment opportunities while continuing to protect our historic status." Ms. Moore and Ms. Barlow objected to combining the sentence in that way.

Mr. Sengstock proposed: "Goal 1. Provide stable year-round employment opportunities for Jerome's residents." This was agreed to by the committee. He then proposed Goal Two: "Assure that the preservation of Jerome's historical character is always key consideration to any new business development effort."

Ms. Hardie wanted to make Goal 2 stronger, for example, that the preservation of the historical character is imperative.

After some discussion, Mr. Sengstock suggested for Goal 2: When considering any new business development effort, the protection of Jerome's historic character must always be a key component." The committee agreed.

The remaining text in the Goals section was struck.

Mr. Sengstock read the new Objectives introduction. Ms. Hardie preferred to use the word "objectives" rather than "guidelines." The committee agreed.

Mr. Sengstock read the new Objective 1 as revised at the previous meeting. The committee considered "while," "by," and "and," finally settling on "by": by improving the Design Review Board's review procedures.

Mr. Sengstock read Objective 2. There was discussion about how that objective could be accomplished. Ms. Moore pointed out that this had been discussed at length at the previous meeting. How exactly would the Town diversify the economy? Mr. Sengstock suggested scratching Objective 2 altogether.

Ms. Christensen suggested for Objective 2: "Encourage diversification of the employment base of the Town."

Ms. Christensen objected to the word "by" in Objective 1. She suggested turning the sentence around to read "By improving the Design Review Board's review procedures, continue an organized and coordinate approach to preserving the historic character of the Town."

Ms. Hardie wondered what this objective has to do with the Economic Development section. Mr. Sengstock said because the Town's historical status is its economic engine. Ms. Moore said improving the review procedures will make it clearer when someone comes in to start a business.

After further discussion, Mr. Sengstock suggested "Improve the Design Review Board's procedures for considering residential and commercial building renovation and new construction."

Ms. Christensen agreed but also wanted to include signage as being a significant part of the visual impact of the town. The committee agreed. The goal now reads: Improve the Design Review Board's procedures for considering residential and commercial building renovation, new construction, and signage.

Mr. Sengstock invited the committee to review the Economic Development section before the next meeting and bring forward any additional goals and objectives they would like to include.

ITEM 6: Future Agenda Items

All sections of the plan are done except Water and Open Space and Historic Preservation.

ITEM 7: ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Moore made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Hardie seconded. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Approval on next page.

Minutes
General Plan Steering Committee
Wednesday, January 20, 2016 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Julian on February 10, 2016.

Approved: _____

Chair

Date: _____

2/24/2016

Attest: _____

Vice Chair

Date: _____

2-24-16